

Appl. No. 09/979,493  
Atty. Docket No. 7611M  
Amdt. dated 28 February, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of 26 August, 2004  
Customer No. 27752

### REMARKS

#### Claim Status

Claims 1 - 37 are pending in the present application. No additional claims fee is believed to be due.

#### Rejections Under 35 USC §103(a)

Claims 1-5, 11, 15-22, and 27-33 have been rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Family Tree House website in view of Adler et al (U.S. 6,675,356). Claims 6-10, 12-14, 23-26, and 34-37 have been rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Family Tree House website in view of Tuzhilin et al (U.S. 6,236,978). These rejections are hereby respectfully traversed as the combination of the Family Tree House website and Adler et al references, and the Family Tree House website and Tuzhilin et al references, do not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness because it does not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations of Claims 1-5, 11, 15-22, and 27-33 and Claims 6-10, 12-14, 23-26, and 34-37. Therefore, the claimed invention is unobvious and that the rejection should be withdrawn.

Neither the Family Tree House website, Adler et al (U.S. 6,675,356), or Tuzhilin et al (U.S. 6,236,978), either alone or in combination, teach or suggest all of the claim limitations of Claims 1-5, 11, 15-22, and 27-33 and Claims 6-10, 12-14, 23-26, and 34-37, and, therefore, does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness (see MPEP 2143.03). Specifically, the Family Tree House website, which is directed towards recording and displaying user-inputted and selected genealogical data, the Adler et al reference, which is directed towards the automated collection of disparate data, and Tuzhilin et al, which is directed towards methods of generating user profiles, do not teach nor suggest Applicant's present systems and methods for facilitating and/or managing family interaction and communication through the use of automatically generated value-added family information.

With respect to the Family Tree House web site the Examiner states that the site offers "a method assisted integrated family information management system" that comprises: a "central module containing at least one data file;" a "one family data file;" a "user interface system;" "at least one information source connected to said central control module;" and "relevant family information obtained from said information source."

8 of 13

Appl. No. 09/979,493  
Atty. Docket No. 7611M  
Amdt. dated 28 February, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of 26 August, 2004  
Customer No. 27752

However, the Applicant respectfully asserts that the Examiner's interpretation of the Family Tree House website is in error.

As can best be understood from the web pages provided by the Examiner the Family Tree House website simply allows a registered user to input predefined and structured genealogical relationships, and then display and/or disseminate via user inputted e-mail addresses that same structured relationship graphically, using HTML code. In contrast, Applicant's present invention is directed towards a family information management system that provides a computer assisted method for enabling family members to continuously maintain contact, while also receiving helpful and necessary information regarding a family's daily activities (Specification, Page 9, Line 18 - Page 10, Line 1). Value-added family information is developed in Applicant's present invention by the central control module from multiple information sources that are connected and/or integrated to the central control module (Specification, Page 8, Lines 16-21).

In contrast, however, the Family Tree House site, as best as can be determined from the provided web pages, only contains limited information on specific familial relationships (e.g., names and dates of birth/death of parents and children), and does not contain any information at all on a family's daily activities, preferences, or schedules. Moreover, as best as can be determined, the Family Tree House application does not have any access to any information sources other than user inputted familial relationship that may be used to develop and communicate value added family information in the manner of the present invention. The Examiner states that Pages 10-12 of the office action provide suitable examples of information sources connected to the central control module. However, the Applicant respectfully asserts that the Examiner's interpretation is in error. The "plurality of sources" the Examiner cites (e.g., Census Bureau and CZECH Information Center) are not connected to the central control module in the manner defined in Applicant's present invention. Rather, these databases are separate and distinct from any available to the Family Tree House application and require the user to manually search, identify, record, and transfer any data from such a database back to Family Tree House application. Moreover, such databases only contain similar or identical information as to that which was inputted by the user in the Family Tree House application, and would not generate the value added family information contemplated in Applicant's present invention.

9 of 13

Appi. No. 09/979,493  
Atty. Docket No. 7611M  
Amdt. dated 28 February, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of 26 August, 2004  
Customer No. 27752

Moreover, even if the combinations of the Family Tree House website and Adler et al (U.S. 6,675,356), and the Family Tree House website and Tuzhilin et al (U.S. 6,236,978), taught each and every element of Applicant's present invention, the references do not contain a motivation to be combined and, therefore, do not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness (see MPEP 2143.03). As detailed herein, the Family Tree House website reference discloses an on-line application that allows a registered user to input predefined and structured genealogical relationships (e.g., Spouse-Spouse or Parent-Child), and then display and/or disseminate via user inputted e-mail addresses that same limited, structured relationship graphically; the Adler et al reference discloses a system for managing, with user guidance and input, calendar information obtained from a variety of sources; and the Tuzhilin et al reference (6,236,978) discloses systems and methods for generating user profiles. Nowhere in the cited web site or other references provided by the Examiner can Applicant find any indication that the Family Tree House application could be modified and/or combined with any other application or technology to produce Applicant's present invention of a family information management system as is required to show a *prima facie* case of obviousness (MPEP 2142). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejection of Claims 1-37 is in error and should be withdrawn.

10 of 13

Appl. No. 09/979,493  
Atty. Docket No. 7611M  
Amdt. dated 28 February, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of 26 August, 2004  
Customer No. 27752

Conclusion

In light of the above remarks, it is requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections under 35 USC §103(a). Early and favorable action in the case is respectfully requested.

This response represents an earnest effort to place the application in proper form and to distinguish the invention as now claimed from the applied references. In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of this application, entry of the amendments presented herein, and allowance of Claims 1-37 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY

By \_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

Date: 28 February, 2005  
Customer No. 27752

Erich D. Hemm  
Registration No. 47,286  
(513) 634-8960

11 of 13